FORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

U.S. Department of Commerce Patent and Trademark Office

Docket No.: RPS6097

Serial No.: 10/016,352

Tanner et al. Applicant

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT

November 2, 2001

1732 1722

Filing Date

Group Art Unit

Examiner's Name

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

Examiner's Initials	Document No.	Date	Inventor(s)	Class/Sub-class
y-2.	1,970,396	Aug. 14, 1934	R.P. Scherer	-18-21 -
92	2,288,327	Jun. 30, 1942	R.P. Scherer	-18-21
n.	2,774,988	Dec. 25, 1956	F.E. Stirn	18-15
9.2.	2,775,257	Dec. 25, 1956	F.E. Stirn et al.	137-341
<u> 91.</u>	4,028,024	Jun. 7, 1997	Moreland	425/133.1
gr.	4,817,367	Apr. 4, 1989	Ishikawa et al.	53/454
92	4,940,499	Jul. 10, 1990	Lebrun et al.	156/69
JR.	5,146,730	Sept. 15, 1992	Sadek et al.	53/454
JA.	5,246,635	Sept. 21, 1993	Ratko et al.	264/4
Jr.	5,735,105	Apr. 7, 1998	Stroud et al.	53/411
M.	5,740,660	Apr. 21, 1998	Rowe	53/454
12.	5,761,886	Jun 9, 1998	Parkhideh	53/454
1.1	6,022,499	Feb. 8, 2000	Schurig et al.	264/4
- YL.	6,217,902	Apr. 17, 2001	Tanner et al.	424/456

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

Examiner's Initials	Document No.	Publish Date	Applicant(s)	Country	class	Sub
92	WO 01/03677	01/18/01	R.P. Scherer Technologies, Inc.	PCT	1_1	-
R	WO 94/13249	06/23/94	R.P. Scherer Corporation	PCT	-	-

RECEIVED

AUG 2.8 2002

TC 1700



N.

Alieberman

1. "The Theory and Practice of Industrial Pharmacy" (Lachman, Liberman and Kanig), 3d. edition, published by Lee & Febiger 1986, Pp. 1-2.

 \mathcal{U} .

2. "Softgel (Soft Gelatin Capsule) Update, Robert F. Jimerson, Reprinted from Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy (Interphex '86 Conference) Vol. 12, No. 8 & 9, 1986, pp. 1-5.

Examiner:_	Tregs	Teyron	Date Considered:	4-4-03
		•		

Attn Examiner: Please initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP §609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to Applicant.

The identification of any document herein is not intended to be, and should not be understood as being an admission that each such document, in fact, constitutes "prior art" within the meaning of applicable law since, for example, a given document may have a later effective date than at first seems apparent or the document may have an effective date which can be antedated. The "prior art" status of any document is a matter to be resolved during prosecution.

RECEIVED

AUG 2 8 2002

TC 1700